DRAFT

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT

Public Meeting Notes

September 15, 2003 - 4:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Holiday Inn, 5801 Southfield Service Drive

Purpose: This was the first in a series of four public meetings to inform the public of the

practical alternatives for intermodal terminal development.

<u>Attendance</u>: See attachment.

Discussion:

Bob Parsons opened the meeting, welcomed those in attendance, and introduced Mohammed

Alghurabi and Joe Corradino. Joe Corradino then proceeded to present approximately 30

minutes of information. A question-and-answer period followed. Questions (Q), comments (C),

and responses (R) follow:

Q: There is a concern for asthma and truck traffic. Are there truck estimates now?

R: The truck trip forecasts are being updated. The earlier figure of 16,000 truck trips per day

has been refined based on better information about the relationship between intermodal lifts

and trucks, more recent survey data, and a revised forecast of lifts. It is now expected that,

with intermodal consolidation, there would be a total of 5,000 to 8,000 truck trips daily in

2025, that's 2,500 to 4,000 truck trips in and the same number out of the consolidated

terminal. Without consolidation, these numbers would be lower by about a third and the

truck trips would be split among four terminals. Under the No Action alternative, the

numbers would be lowered by about one-half from the 2025 consolidation numbers and also

split among four terminals.

Preliminary for Discussion Purposes Only

- Q: How were the communities chosen to receive rail terminals?
- R: The terminals were there already; some for 150 years. They were not chosen by MDOT. Highland Park was considered, especially in earlier studies for intermodal development. Recent projects in the area have reconfirmed the earlier conclusion that this area not a candidate for a modern intermodal rail yard.
- *Q*: What is the commitment to help the community?
- R: We believe there's a way to benefit the terminal area host community(ies) by returning to the local area which surrounds a terminal some of the positive economic impact of intermodal that spreads throughout the state.
- C: Community Action Against Asthma believes that NS and CSX in southwest Detroit have done nothing to benefit the community. They don't want a thriving community. The Latino population is growing. Promised mitigation will not occur. With four sites, the federal government would lose out, but with consolidation, the federal government would benefit, and so they are pushing consolidation.
- R: There would be both positive and negative effects with both consolidation and with intermodal development at several existing terminals. The federal government has no preference of either option.
- C: The tri-fold handout looked too "busy." The railroads have not been good to the community. The Dearborn Police Headquarters is not a good place for a meeting.
- R: If there is a project, control will be exercised over the railroads' actions through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that will be part of the final EIS. This MOA will hold the railroads accountable for future actions. With respect to the meeting at the Dearborn

Police Headquarters, MDOT was aware of concerns about holding the meeting there, but in consultation with a representative of the City of Dearborn found that public meetings have been successfully held at the location before.

- C: Ford Motor Company does not see the automotive sector driving intermodal growth. At the time that the Livernois Yard developed, it was at the outskirts of town. Why would you expand rail yards that are now surrounded by development? The market for intermodal should be allowed to take care of itself and individual rail yards should expand on their own in response to demand.
- R: Market forces are at work regardless of the alternative. But, if government gets involved, there is a potential to benefit the local communities that surround an intermodal terminal. There is an idea, for example, to create a freight village to redevelop areas around a terminal and create/provide jobs.

Another objective of the DIFT project is to address the rail line blockages that slow rail movements in the region, at such past critical points as Delray and Milwaukee Junction.

In response to the lack of intermodal demand implied by the Ford representative, it was noted Riverview Trenton terminal has been approved by the U.S. Surface Transportation Board based on growing demand for intermodal in the region.

C: The Ford representative concluded by noting that Ford had an issue with access to its

Rouge assembly plant as it may be impacted by developments at the Livernois-Junction

Yard.

- C: A representative of the Southfield/Jeffries Industrial Park Business Association noted that some automakers might not now support rail because they make trucks, but that as shipping prices change, these auto companies will use rail. He noted that it is important to address environmental concerns such as noise, dust and aesthetics, and that the way to do this was by pursuing one of the alternatives for intermodal terminal development that involve government funding. There is a way to get dollars for the local community out of every lift that occurs. He noted further that newly manufactured trucks are very efficient and low-polluting. He asserted that developing the DIFT Project would open job opportunities. He also noted that the meeting location at the Holiday Inn was very near Dearborn and so those who felt intimidated by going to the Dearborn Police Headquarters could have attended the Dearborn Holiday Inn meeting.
- *Q*: Are health impacts to be part of the study?
- R: A methodology to address air quality, including air toxics, is being developed that will be qualitative, not quantitative. FHWA does not believe that the science is sufficiently advanced at this time to do a quantitative analysis of health effects due to air quality. If the science advances, and EPA passes standards with respect to certain pollutants, then additional analysis would occur.
- Q: Southwest Detroit will not meet the new $PM_{2.5}$ standard. Who should the community approach to have an analysis of health effects performed?
- R: The air quality methodology is receiving the highest level of attention in the Washington office of the federal Highway Administration. You are welcome to contact them. The Federal Highway Administration representatives do not believe the science is available to quantify health risks. Nevertheless, an air quality dispersion (quantitative) analysis was

performed during the DIFT Feasibility Study. It is contained in Technical Memoranda 3 and 4, which are on the project web site.

C: In my neighborhood there's a lot of dust.

R: If the DIFT project goes forward, there will be mitigation of dust problems at intermodal terminals regardless of how health effects are defined – qualitatively or quantitatively. It is this type mitigation that is the key. Without the project, there is no assurance of mitigation.

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT

Public Meeting Notes September 15, 2003 - 4:30 to 8:30 p.m. Holiday Inn, 5801 Southfield Service Drive

Attendance

	Name	Representing
1.	Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT
2.	Michael Boetcher	Detroit Planning & Development Dept.
3.	Russell Clark	Northwest Neighborhood City Hall
4.	Guy Corradino	The Corradino Group
5.	Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group
6.	Jeff Edwards	MDOT Metro Region
7.	Mario Ferini	Ferini Bros
8.	Ursula Ford-Pitts	Community Action Against Asthma
9.	Jim Hartman	The Corradino Group
10.	Randy Henke	OHM
11.	Andrew Hoefner	Detroit Fire Department
12.	Bob Hunt	Wayne County
13.	Bruce King	Dept. of Environmental Affairs
14.	Ken Kucel	Wayne County Engineering
15.	Mike Kunz	OHM
16.	JoAnna Ladki	ACCESS/CBRA
17.	Paul Nye	Ford Motor Company
18.	Bob Parsons	MDOT Communications
19.	Brenda Peek	MDOT Communications
20.	Sheri Piacenti	MDOT Real Estate
21.	Gary Pollard	State Senator Irma Clark's office
22.	Maria Anita Salinas	Community Action Against Asthma
23.	Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group
24.	Olga Savic	Representative Tobocman's office
25.	Bill Schrader	Personalized Marine Maintenance
26.	Ron Stewart	Community Action Against Asthma
27.	Ted Stone	The Corradino Group
28.	Doug Strauss	Benesch

 $L: \backslash Projects \backslash 2846\text{-}A \backslash WP \backslash notes \backslash Public \backslash Sept~03~round \backslash Sept15.doc$